RICHARD M. FRANCO (CBN 170970) LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO 6500 Estates Drive

Oakland, CA 94611 3 Ph; 510-684-1022

1

2

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Email: rick@rfrancolaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC., a non-profit California corporation,

Plaintiff.

V.

B.N.G. ENTERPRISES INCORPORATED, an Arizona Corporation, and FUSION FORMULATIONS, L.L.C., an Arizona Limited Liability Company,

Defendants.

Case No. RG 1 5 7 8 2 4 0 3

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES

Health & Safety Code §25249.5, et seq.

BYFAX

Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("PLAINTIFF" or "ERC") brings this action in the interests of the general public and, on information and belief, hereby alleges:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action seeks to remedy the continuing failure of Defendants B.N.G. ENTERPRISES INCORPORATED and FUSION FORMULATIONS, L.L.C., ("B.N.G. ENTERPRISES" or "DEFENDANTS") to warn consumers in California that they are being exposed to lead, a substance known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm. DEFENDANTS manufacture, package, distribute, market, and/or sell-

in California certain products containing lead (collectively, the "PRODUCTS"):

- BNG Enterprises Inc. Natural Treasures Horny Goat Weed
- BNG Enterprises Inc. Natural Treasures Miracle Breast
- BNG Enterprises Inc. Herbal Clean Simply Slender Master
 Cleanse
- 2. Lead (hereinafter, the "LISTED CHEMICAL") is a substance known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.
- 3. The use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS causes exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL at levels requiring a "clear and reasonable warning" under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code ("H&S Code") §25249.5, et seq. (also known as "Proposition 65"). DEFENDANTS have failed to provide the health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.
- 4. DEFENDANTS' past sales and continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings, cause individuals to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL that violate Proposition 65.
- 5. PLAINTIFF seeks injunctive relief enjoining DEFENDANTS from the continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS in California without provision of clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm posed by exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS. PLAINTIFF seeks an injunctive order compelling DEFENDANTS to bring their business practices into compliance with Proposition 65 by providing a clear and reasonable warning to each individual who has been and who in the future may be exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the use of the PRODUCTS. PLAINTIFF also seeks an order compelling DEFENDANTS to identify and locate each

¹ All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law, unless otherwise specified.

individual person who in the past has purchased the PRODUCTS, and to provide to each such purchaser a clear and reasonable warning that the use of the PRODUCTS will cause exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL.

6. In addition to injunctive relief, PLAINTIFF seeks an assessment of civil penalties up to the maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per exposure authorized by Proposition 65 to remedy DEFENDANTS' failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS because, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS are each a business having sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise intentionally availing themselves of the California market through the distribution and sale of the PRODUCTS in the State of California to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 9. Venue in this action is proper in the Alameda Superior Court because the DEFENDANTS have violated California law in the County of Alameda.
- 10. On April 10, 2015, PLAINTIFF sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65 ("Notice") violations to the requisite public enforcement agencies, and to DEFENDANTS. The Notice was issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code \$25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violators. The Notice included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing

individuals; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemical involved, the routes of toxic exposure, and the specific product or type of product causing the violations, and was issued as follows:

- a. DEFENDANTS were provided a copy of the Notice by Certified Mail.
- b. DEFENDANTS were provided a copy of a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903.
- c. The California Attorney General was provided a copy of the Notice via online submission.
- d. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by the attorney for the noticing parties, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h) (2).
- 11. At least 60 days have elapsed since PLAINTIFF sent the NOTICE to DEFENDANTS. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code §25249.5, et seq. against DEFENDANTS based on the allegations herein.

PARTIES

12. PLAINTIFF is a non-profit corporation organized under California's Corporation Law. ERC is dedicated to, among other causes, reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic substances, consumer protection, worker safety, and corporate responsibility.

or exposure to a chemical listed pursuant to Section 25249.8(a) of the Act is occurring. No

knowledge that the discharge, release or exposure is unlawful is required." (27 California Code

25

26

+

20. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code §25249.7). The phrase "threatening to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial likelihood that a violation will occur." (H&S Code §25249.11(e)). Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of the Act. (H&S Code §25249.7.)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 21. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed the chemical lead as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the warning requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 CCR § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.5, et seq.). Due to the high toxicity of lead, the maximum allowable dose level for lead is 0.5 ug/day (micrograms a day) for reproductive toxicity. (27 CCR § 25805(b).)
- 22. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed the chemicals lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became subject to the warning requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993 (27 CCR § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.6 et seq.). Due to the carcinogenicity of lead, the no significant risk level for lead is 15 ug/day (micrograms a day). (27 CCR § 25705(b)(1).)
- 23. To test DEFENDANTS' PRODUCTS for lead, PLAINTIFF hired a well-respected and accredited testing laboratory. The results of testing undertaken by PLAINTIFF of DEFENDANTS' PRODUCTS show that the PRODUCTS tested were in violation of the 0.5 ug/day "safe harbor" daily dose limit set forth in Proposition 65's regulations. Very significant is the fact that people are being exposed to lead through ingestion as opposed to other not as harmful methods of exposure such as dermal exposure. Ingestion of lead produces much

higher exposure levels and health risks than does dermal exposure to this chemical.

- 24. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANTS, therefore, have knowingly and intentionally exposed the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS to the LISTED CHEMICAL without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
- 25. The PRODUCTS have allegedly been sold by DEFENDANTS for use in California since at least April 10, 2012. The PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.
- 26. On April 10, 2015, ERC served DEFENDANTS and each of the appropriate public enforcement agencies with a Proposition 65 Notice, a document entitled "Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5" that provided DEFENDANTS and the public enforcement agencies with notice that DEFENDANTS were in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn purchasers and individuals using the PRODUCTS that the use of the PRODUCTS exposes them to lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity (a true and copy of the 60-Day Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference).
- 27. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANTS, as persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11, individuals throughout the State of California, including in the County of Alameda, have been exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL without a clear and reasonable warning. The individuals subject to the illegal exposures include normal and foreseeable users of the PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the PRODUCTS.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in the April 10, 2015, Prop. 65 Notice)

Against DEFENDANTS

28. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.

- 29. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANTS, at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use or handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice to the LISTED CHEMICAL, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 30. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS have violated H&S Code § 25249.6 and are therefore subject to an injunction ordering DEFENDANTS to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future customers, and to provide warnings to DEFENDANTS' past customers who purchased or used the PRODUCTS without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.
- 31. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).
- 32. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANTS have caused and continue to cause irreparable harm to citizens of the State of California for which there is no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law. In the absence of equitable relief, DEFENDANTS will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS.

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS, as set forth hereafter.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in PLAINTIFF's NOTICE)

Against DEFENDANTS

33. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 32, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.

	34.	By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANTS at all times
rele	vant to thi	s action, and continuing through the present, have violated H&S Code §25249.6
by,	in the cou	rse of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use
or h	andle the	PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice to the LISTED CHEMICAL, without first
prov	viding a cl	ear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§
252	49.6 and 2	25249.11(f).

35. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation for each unlawful exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the PRODUCTS.

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS, as set forth hereafter.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF accordingly prays for the following relief:

- A. a preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), enjoining DEFENDANTS, their agents, employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or participating with DEFENDANTS, from distributing or selling the PRODUCTS in California without first providing a clear and reasonable warning, within the meaning of Proposition 65, that the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL;
- B. an injunctive order, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), compelling DEFENDANTS to identify and locate each individual who has purchased the PRODUCTS since April 10, 2012, and to provide a warning to such person that the use of the PRODUCTS will expose the user to chemicals known to birth defects and other reproductive harm;
- C. an assessment of civil penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), against DEFENDANTS in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65;
- D. an award to PLAINTIFF of its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, as PLAINTIFF shall specify in further

Yes	application to the Court; and,			
2		such other and further relief as may be just and proper.		
3	son statut at a same			
4	DATED:	8 (8 15 LAW OFF	FICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO	
5	Per de la constante de la cons			
6			7/12	
7		Richard M	Franco	
8		Attorney for Environment	or Plaintiff ental Research Center, Inc.	
9				
10				
11				
12	000000000000000000000000000000000000000			
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
очениванична				

EXHIBIT A